3.   (amended) The method of claim 1, further including prior to step (c) a step of communicatively coupling said first merchant, said second merchant, and said server via an internet.

4.   (amended) The method of claim 1, wherein step (a) includes capturing consumer information at said first merchant.

5.   (amended) The method of claim 1, wherein step (a) includes capturing consumer loyalty information at said first merchant.

6.   (amended) The method of claim 1, wherein step (b) includes storing captured said transaction information on a server external to said first merchant.

7.   (amended) The method of claim 1, wherein step (b) includes forwarding captured said transaction information to said server.

8.   (amended) The method of claim 1, wherein step (c) includes applying captured said transaction information to a transaction involving said consumer at a second merchant and initiated by a browser on a personal computer connected to the internet.

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 were examined and rejected, and the Examiner objected to the executed Declaration for not explicitly reciting that the within application was a continuation in part application. With respect to the claims, claims 1-8 were rejected as being obvious and unpatentable under 35 USC §103 over USP 5,642,485 to Deaton, in view of USP 6,009,411 to Kepecs.

Applicant's response regarding the Declaration is set out below. Applicant has amended claims 1-8. Claims 1-8 are pending.

REGARDING THE DECLARATION:

Applicant does not understand the Examiner's objection to the Declaration. Page 2, commencing with line 21 of the subject application states in relevant part:

> This application claims the benefit of the filing date(s) of the following earlier application(s): . . . .